

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 are currently pending in the application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Owen et al. (4,789,528). Owen is directed to a technique for sequential rotation of reactors in a multi-reactor catalytic conversion system. As set forth in the Summary of the Invention, Owen is directed to a system for sequentially rotating a system of three or more reactors to allow the most fresh, or newly generated, catalyst to be in the last process flow position and the least active, or most aged, catalyst to be in the first position, with one reactor in the regeneration mode. Thus, Owen describes a process in which one of the reactors is always in the regeneration mode and the other reactors are operated in series with the reactor having the oldest catalyst being in the first position and the reactor with the newest catalyst being in the last position. As described in column 3, beginning at line 7, the reactor with least fresh catalyst receives fresh feed first from the feed source, and the reactor having freshest catalyst received the partially converted feed last.

The present invention, on the other hand, is directed to a system for carrying out chemical reactions in which two or more single unit operated reactors are operated in parallel with one or more common reactant feed lines and one or more common product discharge lines. As used in claim 1, the term "single unit operated reactors" means that all of the individual, separated reactors are operated together in parallel as if they were a single larger reactor. As described in the specification, this arrangement provides an efficient and economical process to scale-up chemical processes.

Applicant submits that the system of claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by the Owen reference. Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom, are believed to be patentable over the cited art.

In the Office Action, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haag et al. (4,279,830) in view of Owen. Claim 9 is directed to a process for the preparation of hydrocarbons by reaction of carbon monoxide and hydrogen in the presence of a catalyst using a reactor system as set forth in claim 1. For the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits that

this system is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. Haag does not disclose a system having two or more single unit operated reactors.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration by the Examiner is requested. Should the Examiner find any impediment to the allowance of the case that could be corrected by telephone interview with the undersigned, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

HANS GEORG LEFFER

By /Craig M. Lundell/

Attorney, Craig M. Lundell
Registration No. 30,284
(713) 241-2475

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463